

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
1	I heard several times from the consultants that the demographics in Barrington are unhealthy. Specifically median age of 47 and median income. Unlike the approach of the Comprehensive plan which accepted these realities and emphasized need for senior housing for seniors who want to downsize
2	Market: affordable housing, senior or mixed - that the Town needs, creates unwanted density for the developer to turn a profit. Barrington should offer upscale senior apartments for which there is a need & a market; should be proposed -incl 20% affordable. Not clear how much a developer can change the project neighbors/Town approved. Concern: developer changes the project after signing off/started building realizing it won't be profitable.
3	The visioning study appears to be all that is required. The goals of the community should far outweigh the "market". The market study seems much overdone for 25 Watson and Zion seems to be overcompensating for density so let's preserve what open space we have remaining and give it back to the community.
4	In the visioning phase, points that were agreed upon included preserving open space, preserving the character of the neighborhood, keeping traffic to a minimum to keep the neighborhood safe for children, walkers and bikers. All of these agreements lend themselves to preserving the original building and creating open space. I don't think we need a market study to tell us what is appropriate for 25 Watson.
5	We read the responses from community and nearly every response mentioned that they would like to preserve green space and many noted that this specific area should be used for some affordable housing but could not accommodate an abundance of traffic or noise.
6	Low density, open space for beautiful views safe place for our seniors and low traffic impact with entrance on freemont rd
7	reuse of the existing building is fine keeping as much of its midcentury architectural features as possible speaking to its past use. the rest of the grounds should be left to become a nature preserve.
8	I have enjoyed listening to the commentary and ideas of the consultants. It has been helped to get a unbiased view into the future of 25 Watson but just looking at what one could fit into 7 acres doesn't tell the entire story. Its been equally as eye opening to see this site and vision through the eyes of the community and immediate surrounding neighborhood. Its very easy for someone to come in and talk about possible plans of lot but its entirely another to do so while considering the impact on the neighborhood. There were some excellent points made about preserving low density and the open space.

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
9	I'd like to see the housing remain low density with low traffic flow and open space for the community to enjoy. There are many animals who travel through the woods of the monastery. It's important to preserve this green space. Having an outdoor space for all to use will allow many members of various ages to connect with one another. It's important to retain the neighborly friendships here on Watson and Freemont since the quality of our relationships are crucial to our overall health and well being.
10	The Visioning process was more informative than the Market Study which had very little additional value.
11	<p>I felt that the Visioning Process should have started with some guiding principles informed by the Town's comprehensive plan rather than exploring options, such as high density cluster housing, that are completely incompatible with the site. The visioning process was, however, done well and the overwhelming community input prioritized the need to preserve precious open land, limit impact on the quiet family neighborhood, prioritize housing for 55+, balance community needs with environmental impact. The town care deeply about open space.</p> <p>The market study was less insightful in terms of new information on the one hand, while overtly pushing high density housing on the other. The reasons for promoting high density housing at the 25 Watson site were either not well researched e.g. including one of the most exclusive country clubs in the state as one of the varieties of "outdoor park and water opportunities" close by to argue that there's already plenty of open space access; or outside of the scope of a market analysis: e.g. promoting the idea that Barrington has "unhealthy" demographics to advocate for high density housing. There is a national housing crisis and, as the second highest density state - just behind to New Jersey - that is also the case in RI. But, this small site (less than 20% the size of the Zion site) is not the solution. The comprehensive community plan and its major themes were developed to provide guidance to officials who are dealing with competing demands.</p>
12	I was dismayed reading the Marketing Study. These high density studies spell ruin for this area of town. This is a small neighborhood with an even smaller street. If you don't live here you don't understand what it will do to put high density homes here. We're very close to Providence which is busy, noisy and hectic. Residents coming home through Providence to Barrington must be happy to come back to peace and beauty. I know I do. I feel the same no matter where I go in Barrington.
13	We think the space should be used the way the nuns would have wanted it to be uses. Low density, lots of open space, caring for our seniors and low traffic for the neighborhood. The nuns were quiet people that used to walk peacefully amongst the beauty of their space. They wouldn't want it to be overcrowded and turned into high density condos with no open space.

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
14	Given the lack of open space in Barrington, I think that one of the top goals, regardless of property use is to create low density development (ideally using only the rehabilitated exiting building). The other key goal it to ensure that the use of the space is Senior-focused and allows current Seniors to stay in town.
15	The amount of data presented that referenced the highest number of units possible was overwhelming and did not appear to be in alignment with any appropriate vision of this site's future. In addition, there was a re-occurring theme that because Barrington's numbers and types of housing offered doesn't match some hypothetical standard of how a town's housing should break down that Barrington needs an overhaul. What is missed in this sort of analysis is what makes Barrington unique and attractive to people who move here, and it is because Barrington is different, not in spite of it. It is by nature a small town, bedroom community, and not meant to be a small, urban replica.
16	Transparency is the most necessary ingredient in this process as we move forward with a plan.
17	No comments
18	I think community housing needs is the most important concern that can be addressed. I favor affordable mixed-age housing, with a certain percentage focused on seniors. Also development that is not too dense and that maintains some of the property as open space, walking trails.
19	
20	Main concerns are environmental impact to beach and bay (from additional runoff, foot traffic, and pollution) and wildlife (through decreased natural habitats). Additional concerns are increased car traffic to entire area, including Nayatt and Watson, which are already overburdened due to narrow lanes and no sidewalks; noise and light pollution; and effect on school size if school-aged children move in. If higher density development is selected, considerable thought and attention must be made to thoroughly overhauling and improving the existing infrastructure.
21	Keep as natural as possible low density
22	<p>I find the input in the Visioning Process highly skewed to the abutters and currently do not see a consensus developing. The ideas seem to really be all over the place and it is hard to see any patterns developing. Between the meetings and the Visioning Process document, there is a lot of confusion or disagreement on what it means to have affordable housing, senior housing, or a suitable housing density.</p> <p>I found the Market Study slide deck quite persuasive regarding the high housing costs and associated financial burdens currently found in Barrington. The "missing middle" concept seems like the right fit for this area, and with only 40 units, this could certainly add to the housing needs without too high a development intensity. Surely it is a far reduction from the 240-400 units mentioned in the analysis. I would advocate for full development of affordable housing on this site.</p>

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
23	I think we should have also considered an actual medium density option.
24	The Discovery Phase resulted in some great feedback from community members. In my opinion, affordable senior housing and maintaining some of the greenspace were the most repeated interests of the community. I am in agreement that those should be our priorities.
25	
26	I agree with a senior living option, but limited units. I don't think that parcel should be strictly housing. I think parking for the beach and open space/fields for the entire community to use makes sense. It's a densely populated residential area. It should NOT have a lot of housing. Barrington should preserve open space rather than jamming houses on every available lot - like what was recently done on Fireside - 2 homes where there was 1. Ridiculous!
27	1.establish land use objectives ;2 perform quick assessment of current conditions of building and costs to deal with existing structural and market deficiencies 3, Integrate market study with use alternatives to determine reuse possibilities
28	I feel that we should try to maintain the current feel of the neighborhood with styles that blend well with existing structures to maintain the continuity of the area.
29	
30	low density, open space, low traffic and caring for our seniors
31	
32	Preserve open space!!!!
33	
34	Thorough and comprehensive - it was an education for us as neighbors to the property we appreciated the detail.
35	I share the views expressed by many others with regard to preserving open space to the greatest extent possible, keeping density of any development low to minimize impact to the neighborhood, preferably by utilizing the existing structure for the new development.
36	Thank you for adding residents to the ad how committee The market study has little value. It considered only the narrow scope of affordable rental housing. It was a missed opportunity to consider market demand for a range of market and affordable senior housing for Barrington seniors,
37	
38	

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
39	I was dismayed by many aspects of the market study. In particular, I found it disingenuous to say that it may not be necessary to create more recreational areas in this neighborhood given the proximity of additional recreation areas. One sited area was the Rhode Island Country Club, which is an exclusive club that does not allow or provide public access. It is not appropriate to count this as "recreation area" as it is not public land for use of the neighborhood. It should also be noted that the land provides habitat to many native plants and birds and that this land should be protected. Additionally, the examples provided such as the Villages on Mount Hope Bay are using much larger areas to create high density housing that should not and cannot be compared to this small residential plot of land. The focus should be on low density housing that preserves the land and provides affordable housing for our elderly community.
40	
41	
42	It has been helpful to have explored several options because it highlighted the main advantages and disadvantages to the community
43	The value of undeveloped space with immediate access to Narragansett Bay is immense. It would be a pitiful waste to deny future generations access to this space. Please do the right thing!
44	The market research seems like it was limited to options that make a larger development acceptable than was originally proposed. I feel like we were told that there could be over 100 residences here and we should be thankful that the town is only going to rezone it for 50 to 70 homes rather than preserving the building as we originally voted.
45	
46	<p>I appreciated all the contributions and details about the vision for the 25 Watson. The priorities mentioned are in line with my priorities as well so I don't have anything to add to the already comprehensive thoughts.</p> <p>With regard to the Market Study, I found some of it alarming with regard to what the market will bear. What I mean is that it's irrelevant to many of us in this neighborhood that the market could absorb a more densely populated site plan. It seems that the Zion Bible site is already trying to cram in way too many units and I honestly can't imagine that we need dense housing here or that anyone around the area would want that. So, for me the only relevant point is what the cost to renovate the building and what the town might be able to charge for units either in the existing building or in small scale cottages.</p>
47	
48	NO GROWTH IN HOUSING DENSITY or ONGOING TRAFFIC
49	
50	

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
51	<p>The Visioning Process reflected the received community input and seem to take onboard what people said they wanted the site to include. It was a fair and reflective study.</p> <p>The Market Study seemed only to consider the development potential of low income rentals. I feel there was a missed opportunity with the Market Study as it failed to explore both low income AND market rate senior housing. The original purchase of the Carmelite Monastery site by Barrington had been to provide senior accommodation. In providing both affordable and market rate senior housing the missing middle could be accomplished by infilling as older residents downsize and free up their larger homes for families to move into town, again this was not addressed by the Market Study. The Market Study did not address the Comprehensive Town Plan of 2015 to develop housing in keeping with the surrounding area, but came up with some basically alarmist numbers of units (250-400 units being quoted) that distracted from the purpose of considering this particular site.</p> <p>The Site/Building assessment done by the Architect and Landscape Architect teams was comprehensive and reflected the natural beauty of this unique property with it's stunning view corridor, and established flora and fauna. It clearly explained the site topography. However I do not think they adequately considered the possible negative effects from site development run off into the existing wetland area and subsequently the bay to the south of the property.</p> <p>Inviting neighborhood representatives onto the Watson Ad Hoc Committee is something I strongly welcome and appreciate. It is very important to give the neighborhood a voice in this process.</p>
52	
53	i thought this was a very thorough and thought out plan. i appreciate allowing the town to give feedback to the different phases
54	<p>Thank you for asking for community feedback it is very refreshing. I think the visioning process says it all. If I lived in that neighborhood, I would want to help the community but preserve the look and feel of the neighborhood that I bought into. Safety for the children should always be the highest priority. Seniors are our second highest priority and would make the least impact on the neighborhood. An extremely high priority for this community is preserving the bay. ALL developments near the bay impact the bay and surrounding wildlife. Please keep all of these at the top of your visioning process.</p> <p>The market study is awful and disheartening that it could even be considered for this property. Leave any kind of density to zion where there will unfortunately be more than we can bear. Our infrastructure and schools are already at a breaking point. Another great reason to limit this property to seniors.</p>

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
55	While the market study shows any units constructed for this site will be sought after, that is no supersize to anyone who went through the effort and wait to become lucky enough to live in this special neighborhood where there has been a resident-organized Fourth of July Parade and day of events for over 40 years . It is in an amazing school district, positioned between the water recreation of Barrington beach and the trails and pond of the Nayatt Woods. It is a quiet neighborhood that is filled with kids - it is an ideal place to raise a family. That needs to be taken into account when determining the final density ratio and it should not compromise the character of place that makes this neighborhood desirable.
56	I feel that before any projects is discussed there should have been an impact study which would include traffic, schooling, and all other costs including police and fire that the cost would fall upon the citizens of Barrington. It is understood that impact studies are difficult to do without a project but in this case the citizens should know to what extent they are taking on a new obligation. as opposed to what could be done as to what things presently are.
57	
58	<p>I have reviewed all documents and I have to say that I am surprised at the high density design options after reading the major points of the visioning process. What was the point of visioning if you are going to completely ignore the major points agreed to? Low density and senior 55+ housing. I saw high and extremely high density options. Why are they even being considered if they go against the visioning?</p> <p>The market survey is absurd. We are a tiny town and do not need to reflect every segment of society equally. Using that study to try to justify a higher density than is appropriate at this site is irresponsible.</p>
59	
60	
61	
62	
63	<p>As a new resident of Barrington as of September 2021, I have been thoroughly impressed with the Design Phase process leveraged by the team of consultants. The Ad-Hoc committee and consultants were extremely thoughtful during this phase of the process and I enjoyed attending each meeting in this phase. I appreciate the patience of both the consultants and the committee to engage the community, especially neighbors such as RISD, RICC, Land Conservation, Save the Bay.</p> <p>I feel strongly that we do not deviate from the initial reason Barrington voted to purchase this property to maintain the building and</p>

Commenter	Please share your thoughts related to the Discovery Phase (Visioning Process, Market Study, and Site/Building Assessment). Documents can be found on the Town's website at https://www.barrington.ri.gov/watson-committee
64	I appreciate the fact that these documents were made available to us.
65	Keeping the character of the neighborhood is critical. We purchased our home in this quiet safe neighborhood and pay taxes based on the current value of our home which will be greatly reduced if cottage committees are developed rather than single family homes.
66	I think the discovery phase shows that Barrington voters would value open space and a public park
67	<p>As a new resident of Barrington as of September 2021, I have been thoroughly impressed with the Design Phase process leveraged by the team of consultants. The Ad-Hoc committee and consultants were extremely thoughtful during this phase of the process and I enjoyed attending each meeting in this phase. I appreciate the patience of both the consultants and the committee to engage the community, especially neighbors such as RISD, RICC, Land Conservation, Save the Bay.</p> <p>I feel strongly that we do not deviate from the initial reason Barrington voted to purchase this property to maintain the building and this precious piece of land on Narragansett Bay.</p>
68	It seemed presupposed that this property should be used for housing. Many residents would prefer a green space or other outdoor community use. We favor outdoor use to parking or housing.
69	I would like to see the site developed to maximize affordable housing opportunities for both seniors and families. And, the definition of "affordable" should be limited to 60% AMI.
70	
71	If this site is not to be used for affordable senior housing, as was initially proposed upon the town purchasing this land it should be used as community recreational space or an open park with parking for town residents to access the beach since all residential roads in the Nayatt area have been labeled "no parking"
72	It was okay. I would have spend less time exploring not housing uses.
73	I have not been involved in this phase.

Commenter	The “Areas of Exploration” in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
1	At the Town meeting the vote at hand was do you want to buy the property and preserve bldg. This by definition limits density. This is a small quiet neighborhood with little traffic. I propose keeping bldg and renovate with 24 units.
2	<p>Building preservation was what the residents voted for - careful: 1 vote is not a mandate. High/medium density not acceptable. Parking: must be managed; will be per force used for beachgoing; increase problems of current illegal parking.</p> <p>Thought: a new building of the same SF footprint as existing, for senior housing at market price on top with views of water/some others affordable. 1 story higher, preserving neighbors' site views acceptable to me. 7x10' storage Units in basement.</p>
3	<p>Density as we have read in the charter and is in keeping with the neighborhood should not reduce more than one level to R25</p> <p>Density does not need to be created at this site when zion will be extremely dense!!</p> <p>Density = more traffic in this safe quiet neighborhood</p> <p>Senior affordable housing is desired by by the town and a high priority of the comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Seniors moving to this site could open up 26 or more (more if H structure) homes in town.</p> <p>Preserving this building, housing for our seniors and making the property accessible to the community is a win win win proposition that should pass with flying colors at any town vote!</p>
4	At the financial town meeting there was a big cry for senior affordable housing which i think we have the obligation to provide. the density should remain as it is today in keeping with neighborhood. the preservation of the building was also voted on which i believe should be honored.
5	This is a residential neighborhood of single family homes surrounded by narrow streets. It would be wonderful to have green space and affordable housing on this parcel, but we must be prudent about how many units are created.
6	A 55 and over community same sentiment as question 1 but again low density
7	no reason to increase its density from what it is now.
8	In sticking with the comprehensive town plan, I believe that the majority are in support of affordable (mix) age-restricted (55+) housing. I like the idea of beautifying the building but if that cannot easily be done then tearing it down while maintaining the existing footprint would be critical. To me, this is a win-win and it seems like this would appease most parties. Sticking to the existing footprint, designating building for affordable age restricted and preserving open/green space seem like the winning combination!

Commenter	The “Areas of Exploration” in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
9	I feel it will be best to focus on housing for our 55+ community including affordable housing in a low density manner.
10	Building preservation and updating, low density with plenty of green space, and housing suitable for 55+ are my suggested priorities. The existing trees and wildlife should be retained as much as possible.
11	This site is currently zoned as R40 and the abutting neighborhood at R25. Preserving the character of the unique neighborhood - quiet, family - is paramount. The road cannot support high traffic there are no sidewalks, the existing parking lot basically sat empty for 25 years (with the exception of intermittent special services). The site is a unique natural resource abutting wetlands. There are regular sightings of owls, wild turkeys, osprey, and the salt marshes (restored relatively recently) are breeding grounds for birds. The architect plans are fabulous, they preserve the wonderful views, preserve the building, restore for 55+ residents, preserve the land, establish walkways that connect to Freemont. We should engage the land trust to establish pollinator pathways, and create native gardens (which would be a unique opportunity for the town). The town purchased the site to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Preserving the building, converting to needed housing for 55+ residents, does that and opens access to others to enjoy.
12	I was happy to see that there are options to preserve the building for our seniors.
13	We like the proposed 24 units and land preservation by far.
14	As I said in point 1, the key goal is low density to preserve both open space and the current character of the neighborhood. The second key goal is affordable housing for 55+. We cannot continue to chase Seniors from this town through the lack of affordable housing and high taxes.
15	My biggest concern about this topic is the high-density proposals. Barrington will not solve its affordable housing mandate by putting as much housing as possible in one, tiny lot. What it would do, however, is irreparably harm a charming, quiet, serene neighborhood. High density brings high traffic, excess noise and light, environmentally harmful run-off, additional strain to an already crowded local school. It would also permanently remove a beautiful open space, the monastery property.
16	Maintaining low density re: housing/traffic and preserving green space are the most important aspects of this entire project.
17	no comments
18	Looking at the slides, I favor the Re-use of the building and cottage court style housing or the cottage court style housing without the building. In each case this seems to offer a range of possibilities, preserving some open space and not bringing excessive density to the neighborhood.
19	

Commenter	The “Areas of Exploration” in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
20	I would prefer green space, but if must be developed for housing, would favor lower density senior housing (affordable, market, or mix) with ownership options. Would also prefer building re-use. Senior housing would ideally have some indoor community space to allow for existing members of the neighborhood to engage new residents. If senior housing, would be nice to have children (and adults) in neighborhood have opportunity to volunteer and help new residents.
21	Redo the existing building
22	The zone change to R-10 is a good fit for this location. There should be a substantial emphasis on affordable housing, as there is a critical need for it in Barrington and in Rhode Island. The minimal affordable housing should exceed the 20% Town requirement and the proposed 9 units in the slide deck. This just does not go far enough to address the need for affordable housing. I do not support single-family detached housing (slide 11 of 24), as it is destructive to the forests located on the borders. I advocate for one of the designs that emphasize the protection of the mature vegetation along the north and possible south and west borders while developing the R-10 density of affordable housing units. Including walking trails would be nice as well as the Fremont connection. This area can be accessed on foot or by bike from nearby Brickyard Pond, and this will increase open space access to the town while addressing the community's needs. Refurbishing the existing building and building additional units may be the best fit, as the idea of a shared 2,000-3,000 sq ft. common space in the former chapel seems like a fantastic idea for citizens who find themselves indoors in the cold winters. That shared community space strongly draws my favor in maintaining the building, or the cottage design could be adopted if a shared indoor community space was possible.
23	There is a high need for affordable housing in town and the existing building does not seem to lend itself to that need. I think we should focus on density and affordable housing.
24	The housing provided on the site should include some form of affordable senior housing but I feel we have not yet delved far enough into the legal specifics of how to make that housing affordable or what our legal options are. With respect to density, I would be in favor of changing the zoning to Senior Village District or Senior Residential Community- I think that either option provides a greater opportunity to provide smaller affordable properties. I am in favor of keeping the building if it can be done in such a way that meets the desired ends. But, since it is certainly not an attractive building (and no one has said it is), I think we should leave tearing it down on the table.
25	

Commenter	The "Areas of Exploration" in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
26	If you want to convert the monastery building into apartments, then do JUST that and leave the surrounding land as open space and parking. Please don't jam many houses, condos, and have the building be apartments too. It's too much and our town can't handle that influx! There is not enough open land/space in this town. Too many houses are being built on tiny lots, and if there's a big lot, then builders try to jam multiple homes where there should be 1 (as noted above). Enough!
27	before spending time on specific designs, obtain consensus on viable alternatives based on community inputs
28	This was presented to the city as a preservation plan and senior housing. I feel we need to adhere to this or put it up for a revote by the community. We should not be trying to change what was proposed or add additional housing options after the vote was completed.
29	
30	Prefer low density, building preservation, and protect the bay's strata, smooth and modern infrastructure that allows protection from floods and water rise. Because high density would be a threat to the landscape and the area's resilience vis- a'- vis sea level rising and considering the excess of rain that New England is encountering. That is why in January it was stated that the site of Zion bible institute is appropriate for high density due to its location and elevation.
31	
32	Preserve open space, walking trails.
33	The monastery itself is a very unattractive design and there should be no monies spent to save and reuse it. Something architecturally interesting should be saved as a historical marker in memory of all the wonderful nuns who passed thru the community. Density of buildings allowed per acre needs to be increased to support a 50+ community. Perhaps 8-10 per acre to include covered parking. 1.5 spaces of parking per unit does not seem adequate
34	For the three areas mentioned in this question we feel an understanding was reached on the part of the community for balancing zoning (existing and modifications), regional and local priorities. All our queries were answered during exploration.
35	Prefer to see senior affordable housing, low density in keeping with the neighborhood, and reuse of the existing structure.
36	Areas of Exploration should have included a range of market and affordable Senior housing for Barrington seniors, which is better aligned with the town comprehensive plan and the motion to purchase the property at the town financial meeting. Providing housing for Barrington seniors would free up family homes for younger families to address the aging demographic in Barrington.
37	
38	

Commenter	The "Areas of Exploration" in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
39	I believe that the originally building should be preserved and should be used to provide affordable housing for our elderly population. I believe that the rebuilding should be focused on low density housing to fit in with the general neighborhood and avoid creating a high traffic area.
40	
41	
42	Affordable housing is ok. Building preservation is mandated by the vote. Density must be low to fit with the neighborhood and avoid opposition
43	Housing so close to so many valuable natural amenities will never remain affordable. Leave the space open for all current and future residents of Barrington to visit.
44	The senior community was the original plan that was presented and I don't think that should change without letting the community decide.
45	
46	<p>I partly answered this with my comments above. In addition, I love the idea of providing housing that would be affordable to first time buyers who will add to the Barrington community AND units that would be affordable to the 55 and older to remain in town. It no longer seems sensible to me to build assisted living or housing for individuals that would need access to public transportation and services.</p> <p>I also would prefer to maintain "lower limit density" and absolutely avoid "middle density".</p> <p>Can Barrington really afford to build out this site as affordable housing and forego the taxes from market priced homes?</p> <p>My other concern is that Barrington should not farm out the development to outsiders as we may end up with a Frankenstein project that gets highjacked and we lose control.</p>
47	See answer to #3 below.
48	
49	Public use of land is ideal. Tillinghause is private and only accessible with key pass..It would be great to have accessible land with walking trails and parking to access beach.
50	
51	The Exploration phase should have considered Senior Housing rather than Affordable Housing. This better aligns with the town's Comprehensive Plan and the reason the town purchased the property in the first place. Thank you for considering the issues of density, to me this is the MOST important issue for this site. I also applaud you for looking at reuse of the existing building on the site, both from an "green" standpoint and for preserving the character of the neighborhood.
52	

Commenter	The "Areas of Exploration" in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
53	i think the housing should be limited to the current structure and allow for the rest of property to showcase the beautiful landscape with nature trails as well as more parking for all of barrington residents to enjoy
54	As I recall we voted to preserve the building for our seniors. If it is affordable for our seniors that would be wonderful and embraced by the entire community. As I stated previously, the lowest density is best to protect our bay and the little remaining open space in this town.
55	<p>I disagree with the thinking in the presentation that this area should/could be zoned R-10. While R-10 clearly exists in the beach neighborhood those areas are composed of homes constructed in the 20's that were part time summer homes. This area is now almost entirely full-time residents and more contemporary lot sizes are R-25. I can also speak to this as a long-time zoning board member where we are seeing seriously concerning proposals for over-development on these smaller lots having an adverse affect on neighborhoods.</p> <p>In terms of use, I think that the Comprehensive Plan as well as the original proposal for the property that the Town Council put before a vote set the direction - some form of senior housing is a clear need for the town. There are many current residents who desire to scale down but still be part of the Barrington community where they have invested their lives.</p>
56	Sites like this near the bay are very difficult to come by and the town of Barrington should use this rare opportunity to share with all the citizens of the town in example at a walking area, playground or beach access.
57	
58	<p>The town voted to preserve the building for our seniors why would we not keep that promise if the building is salvageable.</p> <p>One of the major visioning goals was low density and should be a given.</p>
59	
60	Considering the original purpose of the building is essential in determining its future. The monastery was designed to support a community - and suitably modernized, it can continue that role far into the future. The building has stood as an anchor of its neighborhood for 70 years; there is no reason that it cannot provide the same value for future neighbors for another 70 years, or longer. The building's design is iconic, historically valuable, and just as importantly, unique - attributes that all merit its preservation, rather than destruction and replacement.
61	
62	

Commenter	The “Areas of Exploration” in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
63	<p>-Cottage Courts will forever change the dynamic and charm of this quiet, family neighborhood.</p> <p>-Changing the density of this parcel to allow for 7, 1-acre lots or even R25/R10 would require the elimination of 3-4 acres of wooded area that is a nature sanctuary to a broad spectrum of wildlife.</p> <p>-Based on attending all meetings, the strongest opinion has been to protect this parcel for it's natural beauty and invite the community to share it while respecting the abutters, whom have represented themselves well in protecting an asset for the town.</p> <p>-Barrington has one opportunity to maintain this natural gem and not risk repeating the loss of the Rose Garden next to Nayatt School.</p>
64	
65	Affordable senior housing in the existing building to keep the density low and prevent impact to the bay.
66	Creating more housing is an irreparable decision that would end an opportunity for a public space in town augmented by a singular natural setting.
67	
68	<p>We appreciate that you have cast a wide net with exploitation but most nearby residents prefer not to have housing and would select building preservation as the “least Bad option”</p> <p>We prefer use for outdoor activities to celebrate the landscape and scenic views.</p>
69	Reusing the building for affordable senior housing and and adding affordable cottage court housing on the site for families would be the ideal use.
70	
71	<p>If this area is to be used for affordable housing, it should be done do for seniors or those with disabilities. There is a clear lack of affordable housing in this town for those over 65. Property taxes in this town are extremely high for most working dual income families to be able to afford, never mind those on a fixed income. Rather than running the folks out of town who no longer have children in the school system, something should be done that would offer them the option to remain in town. Affordable assisted living is another option since most assistend living facility options are only affordable to those seniors with large monthly incomes/savings. I do not believe housing for families with children should be entertained. Our school system cannot handle an increase in the K-12 population. We are currently at or exceeding capacity in most classrooms. A bond of \$250 million at the tax payer expense is not an option in order to knock down existing school building and build new mega schools, as we are still in the midst of paying off the \$64 million bond for the middle school project. Middle income families are already being priced out of this town.</p>

Commenter	The “Areas of Exploration” in the design phase is focused on affordable housing, building preservation, and density for the 25 Watson site.
72	The property was purchased with the stated intent of developing affordable senior housing. That's what I and I would argue most of the people who supported the purchase in the FTM understood. I think that a mix of housing with limited outdoor recreation (walking trails) makes the most sense
73	I am concerned about the density on the site and its impact on surrounding property values and traffic patterns. I think a satisfactory solution can be achieved, but hope these considerations are at the forefront when deliberating.

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
1	<p>=Prefer "Keep bldg as is" but renovated (24 units)</p> <p>=2nd choice ReUse Bldg + Cottage courts (18 units + 17 Cottage courts)</p> <p>Above best maintain the character of the neighborhood and limit density</p>
2	<p>Preference pg 13: "Density 'Site Specific- Building Re-use". Pro: preserves bldg as voted. Lower density. Neighbors are used to it; preserves site views. Cons: units too few, too small to make it profitable. Pros: can build larger, market price, senior apartments on top floor - where there is a water view. Suggestion: replace the South glass "porches" w/balconies beyond the exterior wall of the bldg. Should be large enough to be "expanded living space" for small dining table/2 chairs, 2 lounge arm chairs, identical awnings.</p> <p>"Alternate pg 17 "Density Site specific" re-use + cottage courts". Pros re-used bldg: upper floor can be upscale, market price, balconies, etc.</p> <p>Cons: Cottages are small. Seniors OK to walk far frm parking lot in rain/snow???</p> <p>Suggest for cottages: all 2 story. 11-13 market price (view of water?) Others: senior ground floor, others above. Some affordable.</p> <p>CHAPEL: large for the developement. Becz of views, use SW half for upscale apartments. Rest for community space. NEEDED: 6x10's storage units for bikes, etc, for small apartments/cottages. RESIDENT parking: put a roof on it & solar panels.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
3	<p>DENSITY "SITE SPECIFIC" - BUILDING RE-USE - As a community member, this option has me very excited. You meet all of your visioning success factors below. We are taking care of our seniors and not only preserving open space, but providing access to it for the community for generations to come! The nuns would be thrilled with this reuse and taking care of the community was their life's work. I heard a member suggest an H shaped structure which would allow more senior living and maybe even a courtyard in the middle. None of the other options make sense especially not cottage communities. Who needs that when you have a beautiful neighborhood community?!</p> <p>Success Factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy-in from abutters and stakeholders (9) - (this is the #1 plan being discussed) • Addressing needs of community (2) - (senior housing and open space is a win win) • Financial feasibility (2) - (at the last meeting I heard increasing the capacity by using the H configuration which should accomplish this) • Considers neighborhood values • Reuses existing structure -(this is the green option) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o [There are] Strong community feelings - (two of the most discussed needs in town is access to right of ways and open space, and places for seniors to walk - this covers all) o balance those feelings with logistics. o Do not want a repeat of Zion Institute (3) - (this is the opposite of zion) o [This] was a community institution - (I read this as allow community involvement - yes!) o Preserve Chapel only? (This would also be wonderful in addition to the housing at the building) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates affordable senior housing (3) - (the majority of those that spoke at the FTM spoke up to help our seniors)
4	<p>Preference for concept plan is "Site Specific, Building Reuse", as this plan is the most in keeping with the neighborhood and allows us to preserve the monastery, and create housing for our seniors, while also keeping open space for those in the community who would like to enjoy it. Preserving open space is also beneficial to our wildlife. Less development is less harmful impact to Narragansett Bay.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
5	<p>SITE SPECIFIC - BUILDING REUSE could provide affordable housing units for senior citizens and would preserve the existing green space and make that space available to the public with walking trails and scenic vistas with the least amount of impact on the environment. In addition the existing structure is not in a water shed area, and the south elevation should not be built upon because it is too close to the water shed area. It is imperative that we not be shortsighted about the impact all of the building we are doing in Barrington will have on our long term future - green space must be preserved. In addition, we have seen many older neighbors leave Barrington due to the ever-increasing cost of living here. I hate to think that in 20 years, we will be forced to move from this town that we love and where we raised our children because it is no longer financially viable. Adding affordable housing in a environmentally responsible manner is important for the fabric of our community.</p>
6	Site specific building reuse only keep the building footprint and maintain the environment
7	density is a concern.
8	<p>SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse has my vote for the design that best meets everyone's needs and desires.</p> <p>I have major concerns with the "SITE SPECIFIC- COTTAGE COURTS" and feel it is least aligned with the comprehensive plan and look/feel of the neighborhood. It also provides the least consideration for open green space and the environment (would be a major impact on the land and nearby beach/ocean).</p>
9	I am most interested in the BUILDING REUSE plan. This will allow the neighborhood to remain low density while welcoming our seniors to a renovated building while retaining the beautiful outdoor space for the community and wildlife.
10	<p>The Site-specific -- Building Re-use plan is the most preferable plan. It aligns best with the town's comprehensive plan, and it retains the most attractive exterior features of the plot. It also enables community foot transit between Watson Avenue and Fremont streets. In this regard, it should be noted that there are no sidewalks on the adjoining portion of Nayatt Road for foot traffic.</p> <p>The cottage plans do not meet street setback requirements and desirability. They also are most intrusive to the natural beauty of this unique site.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
11	<p>- The plan that best represents the majority findings from the Discovery Phase, present concerns is the DENSITY SITE SPECIFIC BUILDING RE-USE.</p> <p>This plan preserves the building, it has been in the neighborhood for 70 years, it was a place of quiet contemplation and could be wonderful for 55+ community, it limits density, limits impact on the neighborhood, protects the unique open space and bay view, it provides walking paths through the site for community use and connects Watson to Freemont. The plan is exciting. The occupants would be part of the existing family neighborhood.</p> <p>- Even the lowest density plan will impact the neighborhood and would increase traffic. Care should be taken to try to minimize traffic flow.</p> <p>- The other plans add density that will have a negative impact on the quiet family neighborhood. Cottage-style housing is not idea for this site. The neighborhood routinely experiences very strong costal weather include strong winds. The lack of garages and storage would be highly problematic. This is inconsistent with preserving the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>- The full build out options would be tragic. They are completely at odds with the visionary input, the neighborhood, the reasons for purchasing the site, the unique character of the neighborhood, and the town's comprehensive plan.</p>
12	<p>After studying the different options I favor SITE SPECIFIC BUILDING REUSE. I would add a few more 2 bedroom units though. A lot of seniors have relatives or a grandchild who might want to spend more than a few hours with them. Many seniors also have hobbies that take more space than a kitchen table.</p> <p>I think that greenspace is extremely important for the physical and mental health of seniors and all of us! Walking trails open to the public as well would help newcomers feel more a part of this neighborhood. Being able to have a common area in the building is a wonderful incentive for seniors to get to know their neighbors. Interaction with others can combat loneliness and the depression that can follow it. For these reasons and many others, my vote is for Site Specific Building Reuse</p>
13	<p>Land preservation and low impact is our first choice. Taking into careful account the current neighborhood and impact it would have on all of the families. The nuns would be so happy to know that we are taking care of our seniors and ALSO having the community enjoy the beautiful property.</p>
14	<p>The best option is SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse in terms of preserving open space, preserving the character of the neighborhood and minimizing traffic impact.</p> <p>The SITE SPECIFIC - Cottage Courts and the DENSITY "MIDDLE DENSITY (R-10)" options would completely change the character of the neighborhood as well unacceptably eliminate open space.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
15	<p>The re-use of the monastery building while leaving the grounds green space/ walking trail was the best option. The renovated building should be designated senior living. By renovating the building, it maintains the footprint of the current structure, minimizes the potential asbestos spread to surrounding area from remediation, while allowing Barrington residents the use and enjoy the surrounding property. Designated senior living space fills a great need that the town of Barrington has. It also adds little to no burden on the schools. And while each apartment's residents would add some traffic to the area it would not likely overwhelm the surrounding neighborhood. It should be a mix of market rate and affordable senior. The idea put forth of creating an "H" shape from the building was an interesting one and should be explored further.</p> <p>The idea of the cottage courts would be terrible fit for the neighborhood. While the inside of each court may look quaint facing the front porches, the sides and back become storage spaces for trash cans, lawn equipment, and all other miscellaneous items that have nowhere else to go. Prior to Barrington, I had lived in a town with this style of housing and would not recommend it. In addition, this large-scale development idea again brings with it high traffic. The monastery is not the appropriate location for high density housing.</p>
16	Affordable housing and low density are most desired.
17	I think that there is strong evidence we need affordable senior housing, and I prefer the Cottage Court options. My preference is for the 43 cottages with the center building removed, as it provides the greatest opportunity for affordable senior housing. My second choice would be the cottages with the re-use of the existing building. I also like that these options keep some of the natural areas for walking.
18	Looking at the slides, I favor the Re-use of the building and cottage court style housing or the cottage court style housing without the building. In each case this seems to offer a range of possibilities, preserving some open space and not bringing excessive density to the neighborhood. Some of the others do not meet my priorities noted in the first response.
19	I support the Site-Specific Building Reuse plan at this time. If warranted I could support a westward expansion of the building to accommodate more two-bedroom units.

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
20	<p>Prefer Building Re-Use on page 13 (Density "Site Specific - Building Re-Use"). This plan conforms with the original proposal to preserve the building, while at the same time creating new community spaces through the walking loop, potential additional parking for visitors (some of which might be used for limited beach access), and pedestrian path from Watson to Freemont, which would allow for additional walking options to community members. This plan also would have the least impact on the environment due to more green space and create less noise and light pollution to existing neighbors by having additional vegetation buffers.</p> <p>I would not favor the higher density plans, especially the ones on pages pages 11 (Density "Middle Density" (R-10)) and 16 (Density "Site Specific - Cottage Courts"), as these would invite too many people, too much traffic, and have a potentially devastating environmental impact. The higher density plans on pages 11 and 16 also provide no common areas for the new residents to gather. The entire property will be covered with housing and afford no place for the hypothetical residents to gather. Seems isolating.</p>
21	Low density keep and preserve the building with 25 units of over 55 senior living
22	<p>The designs with R-10 zoning (slides 16 and 17 of 24) strongly support the design phase kick-off findings and market analysis from the Discovery Phase. All of the detached single-family designs (slides 6, 7, and 11 of 24) present significant concerns because they would likely lead to the destruction of the mature forest, which if lost would detract from the character of the neighborhood. In this way, multi-family structures and/or the cottage court concepts maximize open space while targeting the serious affordable housing needs of the community. Affordable housing units should be maximized in the development. Further, with multi-family housing, having a shared indoor common space and walking trails should be seen as assets to the new development and to some extent the neighborhood and community due to the connecting open space along Brickyard Pond and the East Bay Bike Path through the neighborhood north across Nyatt Rd. as well as the beach to the south.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
23	<p>I think the cottage courts best represents the findings from the discovery page. With the current housing prices in town there is a need for more affordable options. This plan best addresses that need.</p> <p>The R-40 lot plan gives me the most concern. It does not address any of the findings from the discovery phase. In addition to that, with the looming climate crisis the last thing we need is more suburban sprawl. This one development in town won't impact the climate issue but at some point we need to start looking at our planning and zoning to include more medium density, mixed use spaces where you do not need to get into a car for every activity outside your house.</p> <p>My preferred option presented is the cottage court. I think there is still room in that option to increase the density while fitting the character of the town with some row style housing or a multi level building mixed in with some duplex style cottages. At a minimum, if we can't do multi unit buildings, all the units should be duplex style to increase the density and lower the overall environment impact of each household.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
24	<p>Density "Lower Limit (R-25)" and Density "Middle Density (R-10)"-These do not accomplish any of the goals that the Discovery Phase showed- they are not a means to provide affordable senior housing, nor do they preserve any of the the open space. I would certainly not be in favor of either option.</p> <p>Density "Site Specific-Building Re-Use"-This likewise does not accomplish all of the goals which were discussed in the Discovery Phase. While it does preserve open space, it does not allow for a meaningful amount of affordable senior housing. It is true that it makes the least amount of changes to the property, but it also does not accomplish one of the most commonly-stated goals. I think there are other suggestions that provide a better compromise.</p> <p>Density "Site Specific-Cottage Courts"- I like the cottage court concept a lot. The homes could be small and single level making them hopefully more affordable and senior friendly. I think esthetically this concept is pleasing and would provided for a community feel in the new neighborhood. That being said, I do understand some of the concerns of the neighbors with respect to this option and it would need some further work to find a reasonable compromise measure. If we get rid of the building, I think cottage courts are the way to go.</p> <p>Density "Site Specific" Re-Use + Cottage Courts-In my opinion, this was the best option presented. I think it forms a compromise between the goals of the surrounding community and concerns of the direct neighbors. It provides a meaningful amount of housing while still preserving green space, without providing a dramatic change to the neighborhood.</p> <p>With respect to inside the building-is it possible to do more of a mix of one and two</p>
25	"SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse"
26	I would want to see the largest lot size and minimal housing available. Please do NOT jam many houses or units onto that property! This is a quiet, residential neighborhood that should not be inundated with overpopulated housing on that property! Please do the right thing. Use some of it for housing, but maintain open space for the entire community to use. The town's infrastructure - including roads and schools can't take any more!
27	1. reuse existing building with 24 1 bedrooms units subject to feasibility study 2 Limit number parking spaces per unit with slight increase in visitor parking. Must consider staff parking.
28	I believe the site should reuse the current building only and preserve as much open space for the community as possible. I think this was the site specific option.
29	Preference would be the site specific building re-use.
30	Prefer site specific, building reuse and nature preservation.
31	Site specific!

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
32	No to the cottage plans and any development of housing on this property. Preserve open space!!
33	<p>Cottage courts also known as pocket neighborhood best represents the most suitable use of the property for affordability as well as fostering a sense of community by establishing a 50+ Neighborhood.</p> <p>Covered parking is a must as well as 2 parking spaces per unit.</p> <p>Units should be at least 1200-1600 sq ft and include ample storage within the unit. Outdoor storage is critical as we live in a seaside community with bike trails.</p> <p>I thought the overall presentation was excellent. Seniors seeking to remain in the own community with a need to downsize due to aging considerations, need to have new housing choices to include first floor living, handicapped accessibility, small yards with little outdoor maintenance, shared open space and covered parking.</p> <p>Cottage courts gets my vote. I strongly recommend this style of housing for affordability and a better footprint overall.</p> <p>Jacqueline</p>
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which concept plans best represent the findings from the Discovery Phase? Slide 17, "Re-Use + Cottage Courts" - Which concept plans present concerns? All the others as too high or too low density for regional and local priorities. - Please describe your preference for or concerns with a given concept plan. Slide 17, "Re-Use + Cottage Courts"
35	Prefer to see the Site Specific - Building Reuse concept
36	
37	Site Specific - building reuse

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
38	<p>'Building reuse' best represents the findings of the discovery phase. It also best aligns with key themes in the town comprehensive plan. It could provide a range of affordable and market high density senior housing using the current foot print, while still preserving the open space. It is in keeping with the local community, since the building has been there for over 50 years. I like that the car park is moved to the northern aspect away from Watson, that there is community parking and trails to benefit all Barrington residents, that the building could be beautified in some way, and that there is a walking link between Watson and Fremont to compensate for the absence of a side walk on Nayatt road (which is dangerous). I encourage the architects to investigate adding a wing to make an 'H', which would increase the density, and hence economic viability of the site, with minimal impact to the local community.</p>
39	<p>I believe the SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse is the best options given that this will preserve the original foundation, will be a low density plan, and will be catered towards supporting housing for our 55+ community. I am very concerned about the high density plans that would create an enormous amount of vehicles and traffic in an area with many children and no sidewalks. I am also very concerned about these high density options given the amount of land that would be destroyed in the process instead of focusing on conserving a natural landscape with many native plants and animals.</p>
40	<p>It would seem the SITE SPECIFIC - BUILDING REUSE plan would best suit the site. This option would tick many of the success factors listed in the visioning process (preserving open space, senior housing, compatibility with neighborhood) and align with the 10 year town plan. I believe the cons of increased density heavily outweigh the pros, especially when considering that preserving the building will still supply additional housing of some kind.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
41	<p>Feedback on each density concept</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Middle density R10'. Concept does not align with visioning and the town comprehensive plan. The density is significantly different to the surrounding community, and the density change does not align with the guidance in the town comprehensive plan. It does not preserve any aspect of the open space for the benefit of Barrington residents. The set back is not in keeping with other homes in the area. 2. 'Cottage Courts'. This concept and density is completely out of character with this unique Barrington neighborhood. The density change does not align with the guidance in the town comprehensive plan. The setback is not aligned with other homes in the area. The view of the development from Watson does not preserve any of the view corridors. The design does not account for any external storage of property resulting in a neighborhood that will become an eye sore. 3. 'Reuse + cottage courts'. Although preferable to only cottage courts this concept still does not meet visioning, with concerns of excess density and lack of external storage expressed above. If selected, units 1-4 should be removed as they do not meet the setback required and typical of homes in this area. 4. 'Building reuse' feedback provided in a separate submission. This is my favored concept. <p>In general, I like the concept of community parking and walking trails.</p>
42	<p>Building re-use is the option that meets the three issues mentioned above. The cottage courts options do not fit the surroundings, the neighbors and could generate strong opposition to this process</p>
43	<p>The space should not be further developed. It is an irreplaceable gem of a piece of land that must be preserved as open space for future generations.</p> <p>The closest proposal on the list that achieves this is called "SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse".</p> <p>A better plan would include demolition of the existing structures and the creation of park space.</p>
44	<p>Please protect this special place as an area to be enjoyed by the entire community by selecting the site specific building preservation and reuse plan that will preserve most of the space for all Barrington residents to enjoy while providing scenic affordable senior housing.</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
45	<p>The housing should be limited to the existing or expanded building, with walking trails. The surrounding neighborhood is residential, so a large scale development would be inappropriate, as nearby services would be unavailable for such a large contingent of people. Although a reasonable amount of parking space for the community would be appropriate within the boundary of the property, I don't think there should be street parking allowed (and suggest the use of "no-parking" signs to discourage street parking on Watson Avenue. We should be careful to avoid turning the property into a parking lot for beach access, similar to the town beach. People will flock and overcrowd the area, and the town would not receive any revenues for maintenance of a public parking space as it does at the town beach parking lot.</p>
46	<p>I would support either the building re-use for young people moving out of the city and older adults looking to stay in town. I could see it as attractive community "apartment" living like the Tourister Mills or the reuse in Bristol...but at a lower price point.</p> <p>I would also support the Cottage Court living with or without the existing building.</p> <p>In the end, I have no love of the existing building but I understand the cost of demolition and removal so if keeping it and adapting it is less expensive that would be fine with me.</p> <p>last thoughts...I would be interested in the real feasibility of building and selling (NOT RENTING) units at a lower price point because it seems to me that the Tourister Mills and the apartments in BRistol are incredibly expensive and upwards of \$1,000,000. I would want to know if those are fully occupied or if the apartments in Warren are still trying to find buyers in which case, I would question the need for more apartment type living in Barrington.</p> <p>Can the town afford to spend so much money developing the property if the real estate taxes from the new housing units won't provide enough new income for the town. Can the local schools support an influx of the combined new population in Zion Bible and 25 Watson?</p> <p>Sorry if my comments didn't fit in all the correct boxes!</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
47	<p>Our family moved to Barrington 31 years ago - initially renting a home in the harbor area for a year and then moving to Clarke Rd in 1992. We live here with two disabled adult children. Our neighborhood has both large and small homes with many, many young children (and dogs) who play and walk on the narrow streets. Because of the risk involved in the traffic that would accompany the mid and high density options - I support the SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse plan with preservation of the open space which can be enjoyed by residents and visitors. I support the option for a percentage being set aside for senior (55+) town residents that want to rent as well as subsidized costs for lower income residents that want to rent or purchase a unit.</p>
48	<p>Building re-use, and walking trails, no new housing.</p> <p>EXPLORATION: DENSITY "SITE SPECIFIC" - BUILDING RE-USE</p>
49	<p>Preference is for Site Specific -Building re-use. Public walking trails and parking for beach and trails.</p>
50	<p>Density "Site Specific" Building Re-Use</p>
51	<p>My very strong preference is the Building Reuse proposal.</p> <p>It is not only, as Eric Army said, the greenest option to reuse an existing building, it preserves the Monastery as promised in the original purchase agreement, and maintains the nature of the existing neighborhood as mentioned in the Town's Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>It provides high density accommodation with a low density land use.</p> <p>It encompasses more of what the people of Barrington said they want in the Visioning Process: accessibility to walking trails, the preservation of the beautiful views, some parking opportunities for a range of people with a variety of needs -families with small children, people with mobility challenges, and the elderly to access the site. The inclusion of benches and universal designed & accessible walking trails is something that is very lacking in Barrington at the moment. Recently there was a heartfelt letter to "The Barrington Times" by an elderly resident who said she would love the opportunity to safely walk on the Monastery site and the inclusion of benches and safe trails would definitely make it more user friendly for the whole Barrington community.</p> <p>Preserving the open space and existing flora on this site is very important, not only can it be enjoyed by everyone but like the Rose Garden once it is gone it is gone!</p> <p>I love the inclusion of a connector from Watson to Freemont. As a dog walker I currently have to run the gauntlet and walk along the edge of Nayatt Road to get from Watson to the Tillinghaast property, a dangerous option as there are no sidewalks on this stretch and one is forced to walk close to a busy road.</p> <p>The relocation from the parking lot in the current front of the building to the northern aspect would be an aesthetic improvement and the inclusion of some extra spaces means the site can be enjoyed by all Barrington Residents.</p> <p>I would also love to see the architect team investigate the addition of an extra wing on the west side of the property, creating an "H" shaped building. This would be an economically viable way to add more density with low impact to the site and</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
52	My preference is the Density "Site Specific" Building Re-Use.
53	we are hopeful that the housing will be limited to the existing or expanded building and beautiful walking trails with parking for the community to enjoy
54	I personally love the building reuse with no additional development. "Site specific building reuse". Walking trails and some parking for the community would be wonderful especially for our seniors that do not love the bike path and have difficulty walking on the beach. Lovely idea!! I can picture bird feeders and gardens along the way with benches dedicated to loved ones to enjoy the view. Maybe wooden signs done tastefully to educate folks about the bay and wildlife and perhaps the history of the property. This is something the town could rally behind!
55	I don't support the level of density of the "Cottage courts" approach and I lean toward the "Building Re-Use" approach but I have concerns that there won't be enough in that approach to attract a developer. To me, this is the crux of the challenge. The hybrid approach may be the best way to both satisfy the town in that the building can be saved/re-purposed and there would be a minimal increase in density to allow the proforma to be appealing.
56	development in this area should only include the monastery or the extension of the monastery or elderly housing. anything beyond that would change the total character and environment of the area and an undue burden upon the neighborhood, as well as the Barrington tax payer. It is the wrong spot in Barrington for affordable housing that type of housing does not belong in one of the highest real estate values in town. It is totally out of place with this environment.
57	Site specific- building reuse
58	Reuse of the building and no additional development is my choice. I listened to the meeting where it was recommended the building be extended to an H shape which should accomplish the density without impact to the open space. I heard rentals mentioned more than once but that leads to people who are not invested in the community and do not care about it. There is also a lot of turnover and is disruptive to the community. If someone lives next to a unit that is constantly rented they may not feel a connection and trust. I also don't feel it is a safe option to have a rental building in a community with many children. I hope these will be condos for purchase otherwise you also have to trust a landlord to weed out the renters and desperate landlords will cut corners and lower standards.

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
59	<p>DENSITY "SITE SPECIFIC -BUILDING RE-USE": I believe this is the most desirable use of the space, and re-use of the building. The existing building is historic, iconic, and FAR from the ugliest building or house in Barrington; replacing it with a more contemporary structure would delete an anchor of the neighborhood. The green space around the building is beautiful and a magnificent community asset that deserves to be preserved for human and wildlife use alike. Use of the (suitably updated) building for housing would be an excellent use that maintains the spirit of the community the building was designed to serve, or use for community events would be a visionary way to incorporate this structure.</p> <p>DENSITY "SITE SPECIFIC" RE-USE + COTTAGE COURTS: I think this is the most valid use that includes additional construction. The existing building is historic and iconic; demolition and replacement with cookie-cutter homes would offer less value to the community than re-use of the existing building. Maintenance of green space around the area preserves a communal asset for all inhabitants and community members, rather than subdividing the existing lot into a number of smaller and non-shared lots.</p> <p>DENSITY "LOWER LIMIT (R-40)": Wasteful. Divides this large lot into a number of smaller private ones with no regard for existing structures, communal green space, or affordability.</p> <p>DENSITY "LOWER LIMIT (R-25)": Wasteful, for many of the same reasons as the lower limit R-40. Divides one large shared space into over a dozen smaller private spaces, without regard for extant structures, communal green space, or affordability. Even more chaotic.</p> <p>DENSITY "MIDDLE DENSITY (R-10)": The worst of the plans so far. Cataclysmically shatters the parcel into 41 lots, of which only 9 (22.5%) are deemed affordable - somehow a lower number than the R-25 Senior residential communities or senior village district plans.</p>
60	
61	Given other presented options the "SITE SPECIFIC - Building Reuse" make the most sense.
62	Site Specific Building Re-use. Protecting and conserving the open space and resources so close to the bay for future generations to have as walking paths, historical lands with indigenous peoples archeological findings and fauna lands for mental and physical health for our communities.

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
63	<p>'Density Site Specific - Building Re-Use' support due to it's alignment with the Town Comprehensive Plan and community vote for the Town of Barrington to purchase this land with a commitment to maintain the structure of the building or at a minimum maintain the existing footprint with potential additions. This plan represents a win for the broader community while not diverting from the foundations of the 10 year plan.</p> <p>I support the idea of age restricted affordable housing but not the idea of Multi-age Multi-generational primarily because there is not one single development in the entire US of this variety and to assume the success of one in development in such a pristine part of Barrington is reckless.</p> <p>If we make the mistake and overdevelop this natural beauty, we can never get it back. Let's find a way to benefit the Seniors of Barrington who deserve to stay in town while developing green space to allow the community to appreciate the natural beauty of Narragansett Bay, wildlife and nearby Tillinghast Place.</p>
64	<p>I like idea of the cottages ... but as someone who lives in this neighborhood and who walks down Watson regularly (because it is quiet and peaceful), I am concerned that the design with approx 43 units will be too crowded. I am concerned for the people who live right near there - the abutting landowners and those across the street and just a few houses over. That would drastically change the "feel" of the property and the neighborhood. In my opinion, that is Too Many new buildings on the land and too many new people living there.</p>
65	<p>The best option for the neighborhood, the seniors and the community is the site specific building reuse! Condos for 55+ would be ideal.</p>
66	<p>The area is densely built. Let's keep rare open space open to all.</p>
67	
68	<p>Some of these concepts were difficult to follow in the public meetings. There was insufficient time for community questions to clarify. A more participatory and democratic approach would allow Neighbors and community members to ask questions to better understand these processes. I encourage you to work on your meeting formats to achieve these goals. Many people making decisions do not LIVE in this neighborhood and residents feel this is being imposed upon us during Zoom calls, with the limited opportunity for public participation. This is not an appropriate way to present these concepts. We need more time to review them and to comment on them in an interactive and democratic way during public forums.</p> <p>Our family prefers options that include nature walks That allow us to celebrate the beautiful natural landscapes, or a community center rather than more housing. Thank you. Amy nunn, 20 clarke road</p>

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
69	As stated above, the site would be best used for a mix of affordable senior housing and affordable housing for families. The ideal use is the concept (page 17 of 24 of the Design Funnel) which included repurposing of the building for senior affordable and adding cottage court affordable housing for families.
70	I think the town should reconsider saving this building. It limits what can be done with this property. Apartments in this location does not fit with the landscape. Traffic is a concern. I do not like any of these designs. The best plan would have to been to demolish the structure and sell the lots thereby eliminating traffic concerns, illegal beach use and being able to control open space.
71	If the town will not commit to affordable housing for seniors or open park space to benefit the taxpayers of this town, then it should be sold to a developer for luxury housing lots. The taxes in this town are insanely high and becoming a burden to the middle class working families that reside here. The addition of high end homes near the water would garner high property taxes and help to offset the budgetary issues this town continuously faces, particularly in relation to the schools.

Commenter	Please share your perspective on the concept plans presented during the Design Phase Kick-off on February 3, 2022.
72	<p>It's a little too early to tell and I think we should maintain some flexibility to support robust developer interest. Of the plans presented, I think the hybrid plan where the building is maintained and converted to apartments with the smaller cottage style community makes the most sense. I don't support single family homes with R-40, R-25 or R-10 zoning, and I suspect that just re-developing the monastery creates enough units for a viable development. Tearing down the building and going full cottage style development seems harsh environmentally and a very hard sell with the neighbors. If you took the buildings show right on Watson Ave out of the hybrid plan and provided a landscaped buffer, the neighbors would never really see the housing and it wouldn't change the feel of the area that much. If you had access from Fremont and Watson you could have minimal traffic impact on Watson and Freemont if you had forty total units. I think the following would be a viable unit mix: Monastery up to 20 1 bedroom units, cottages 15-20 one and two and possibly some three bedroom units. Monastery up to 90% age restricted, not less than 10% not age restricted handicapped and disabled. Design should allow for greater handicapped accessible units and common areas. Cottages for family use. Affordability - at least 60% affordable with the rest market units. Approximately 50% of affordable units restricted to 60% of Area Median Income with the corresponding rent limits and 50% of affordable units restricted to 80% of AMI. If we don't allow for lower AMI units we should have 100% affordability. I would push for a sustainable design and construction with a strong preference for solar panels on the roof of the monastery building and possibly the cottages where appropriate. I haven't seen geothermal work very well and it is often more complicated and less effective than projected. Although it is not my area of expertise, I would think that the town's goals and requirements could be communicated through the RFP process and codified in a Purchase and Sale Agreement and we wouldn't have to just count on zoning and other regulatory approaches.</p>
73	<p>I think cottage-style senior housing best achieves the goals set out at the time the community voted to purchase the property, while maintaining the feel of the neighborhood. I would advocate for the combination of cottage-style homes with apartments in the existing building so long as the cost of making the existing building work well for this is not prohibitive. I would like to explore what would happen if the cottages were set just a bit further back from Watson Avenue than they appear to be in the conceptual plans, particularly the all-cottage proposal.</p>